R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 016 701 UD 004 363

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965--TITLE I, ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT FOR FISCAL 1966.

MASSACHUSETTS STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION, BOSTON

PUB DATE 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.72 41P.

DESCRIPTORS- #FEDERAL PROGRAMS, #COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, #PROGRAM EVALUATION, #DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, ANNUAL REPORTS, TABLES (DATA), INFORMATION DISSEMINATION, PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION, INTERAGENCY COOPERATION, COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS, PRIVATE SCHOOLS, INNOVATION, SPECIAL SERVICES, PERSONNEL, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, ESEA TITLE 1, MASSACHUSETTS

THIS REPORT ASSESSES TITLE I COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROJECTS FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTH IN MASSACHUSETTS. THE PROJECTS ARE DISCUSSED IN TERMS OF ADMINISTRATIVE SUPERVISORY SERVICES, PLANS FOR EVALUATION AND INFORMATION DISSEMINATION, PROBLEM AREAS, COORDINATION WITH COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS, INTERRELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER TITLES OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, COOPERATIVE PROJECTS BETWEEN DISTRICTS, AND NONPUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION. OF THE MAJOR PROBLEMS THE MOST APPARENT WERE LIMITED STAFF AT THE SUPERVISORY LEVEL AND A LACK OF SUCH TRAINED PERSONNEL AS READING SPECIALISTS, SPEECH THERAPISTS, AND COUNSELORS. THE PROJECTS ATTEMPTED (1) TO IMPROVE THE PARTICIPANTS' PERFORMANCE IN READING, ARITHMETIC, AND LANGUAGE ARTS, (2) TO ENCOURAGE POSITIVE ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL AND EDUCATION, AND (3) TO OFFER CULTURAL ENRICHMENT. PROJECT ACTIVITIES COMMON TO ALL SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN THE STATE INCLUDED SMALL GROUP AND INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTION, COUNSELING, HEALTH SERVICES, AND FIELD TRIPS. THE PROJECTS WERE FELT TO BE EFFECTIVE, AND THE MEASURING INSTRUMENTS AND MEAN TEST SCORES ARE LISTED. INTERSPERSED THROUGHOUT THE REPORT ARE TABLES AND DATA ON FUNDS, ENROLLMENT, AND SERVICES. (LB)

EDO16701

04363

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Department of Education

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965--TITLE I

Annual Evaluation Report for Fiscal 1966

PART I

1. OPERATION AND SERVICES

In the latter part of September, 1965, two general conferences were held, one in the eastern sector and one in the western sector of the State. The two conferences provided LEA Superintendents and their staffs with preliminary information relative to the philosophy and purpose of the Act (Title I, P.L. 89-10) and the procedure for project planning and operation.

Small group meetings and individual conferences were held in many and most school districts during the remaining months in 1965 and throughout 1966.

Site visits were made during the project planning period, particularly when renovations and remodeling were involved to any appreciable degree.

Title I supervisory staff was available to any LEA representative, either at the district concerned or at State Department offices, or at both localities, as requested by the LEA or as considered advisable by State staff.

2. DISSEMINATION

a. 1. To other local agencies by means of:

newspapers	81%
radio	14%
newsletters and open seminars	5%

2. To the State agency through:

State reports
Visits/Conferences

3. Within the local systems:

Bulletins/newsletters	26%
Faculty meetings	23%
Administration Meetings	17%
School Committee meetings	17%

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Reports to parents	10%
Workshops, home visits	7%

b. State Plans for Dissemination

1. The State Department of Education makes available its project file to LEA representatives.

2. Newspaper releases from State and LEA sources are descriptive of project activities.

3. The "Minuteman", a State Department of Education publication, has included, from time to time, facts and figures relative to Title I Projects and special features that might pertain.

4. An additional publication is in process of development. This would refer in its entirety to Title I Projects and relative matters.

3. EVALUATION

a. Accompanying are five copies of the instrument for project evaluation that was delivered to each LEA in terms of the number of Title I projects approved for such LEA's.

Individual conferences with LEA project personnel were held, as needed, to further define the aspects of the instrument for project evaluation.

b. Names and titles of State personnel involved in providing evaluation assistance:

Robert L. Jeffery, Senior Supervisor
Richard P. Charlton, Supervisor
Daniel A. McAllister, Supervisor
Frederick A. Small, Senior Supervisor
Jane M. Clauss, Senior Clerk and Stenographer
Kathleen Dempsey, Junior Clerk and Stenographer

Mr. Jeffery first named above, constructed the instrument for project evaluation and directed its application and the process for summarization.

c. The State supervisory staff, under the direction of Senior Supervisor Robert Jeffery, was the sole unit involved in Title I project evaluation.

d.

NUMBER OF PROJECTS	EVALUATION DESIGN
6	Two group experimental design using the project group and a conveniently available non-project group as control.
103	One group design using a pre-test and a post-test on the project group to compare observed gains or losses with expected gains.
75	One group design using pre-test and/or post-test scores on the project group to compare observed performance with local, state, or national groups.
22	One group design using test data on the project group to compare observed performance with expected performance based upon data for past years in the project school.
45	One group design using test data on the project group but no comparison data.
70	Other (specify)--Questionnaires, staff evaluative reports, rating scales.

4. MAJOR PROBLEM AREAS

a. 1. Reviewing Proposals

Limited staff during first months of Title I operation made project proposal review somewhat of a formidable task. Ultimate increase in personnel at the supervisory level alleviated the problem.

2. Operation and Service

Again, as in (1) above, staff limitations made for some difficulties in on-the-scene supervision of project operations. Improved service in this category is now provided.

3. Evaluation

LEA's indicated some concern with the involvement in evaluation to the extent of detail and volume of reporting. Some supplementary "urging" was necessary to secure evaluative data from LEA's in a number of instances.

b. Any studied attempt to reduce the amount of "paper work" in LEA involvement might be desirable. School district personnel are additionally burdened each year by an ever-increasing amount of total effort with application and report forms.

5. IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION 205 (a) (1)

a. Types of Projects not approvable when first submitted:

1. Projects weighted too heavily in direction of equipment purchase.
2. Projects concerned with "general education."
3. Projects limited in instructional personnel.
4. Projects not concerned with priority educational needs.
5. Projects not involving non-public school children.

b. Common misconception of LEA's with purpose of Title I and the requirements for size, scope, and quality:

1. Establishment of "Target Area" of economic deprivation.
2. Selection of "educationally disadvantaged" children as project participants.
3. Concept of "concentration" of effort with smaller groups of educationally disadvantaged.
4. Concept of concern with the educationally disadvantaged in a multi-pronged attack

(a) academic remediation
(b) cultural advantages
(c) health factors
(d) psychological factors
(e) environmental and home factors, etc.

6. COORDINATING TITLE I AND COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

a. 168 projects served areas with an approved Community Action program.

b. $9,827,691.00

c. The State Department of Education has made initial and continuing cooperative effort between Title I applicants and respective Community Action Agencies as essential to satisfying application and operational procedures.

Relationships, State Department of Education with State Technical Assistance Agency, (Commonwealth Service Corps) have been candid and fruitful. Project applications are reviewed by the S.T.A.A. prior to State approval.

d. 80 percent of LEA's reported cooperation from CAA was very good. It appears that close coordination made possible a correlation of the objectives of both programs.

e. Approximately 20% of the LEA's found the area of conflicts to be in the educational component. They do not believe the CAP should deal in this area, exercise influence in the community school programs, have veto power over the project or even a vote.

f. 37 percent of the communities reported inter-relationships in such areas as: use of buildings, personnel, enrichment activities, extension of curriculum and reinforcement.

g. CAP not deal with Education
CAP proposals be submitted to LEA
CAP not be headed by a public office holder
Present sign off arrangement be revised to an exchange of information on respective projects
Headstart should be under LEA

7. INTER-RELATIONSHIP OF TITLE I WITH OTHER TITLES OF ESEA

(a-f) One hundred eight projects reported an inter-relationship with Title II of ESEA. Title I made use of library, reference and audio-visual materials to assist the disadvantaged children.

Ten percent of this group utilized Title V by making use of the greater amount of assistance the State Department of Education was able to give the local agencies.

The other three titles were not used in connection with Title I. There were no problem areas reported to prevent one from implementing these titles.

g. Recommendations

Coordination of all ESEA Titles
e.g. - one project uses money from several titles
Simplification of Applications
Fewer Reports
Freedom in Spending
More State Department Personnel

8. COOPERATIVE PROJECTS BETWEEN DISTRICTS

(a-c) There were 15 cooperative projects developed in order to introduce or strengthen special service areas (psychological, remedial, medical) and equipment that a single community could not provide.

No recommendations were made for revising the legislation.

9. NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION

a. All projects submitted for approval are required to have a copy of letters from the LEA to the non-public school.

b. Over 90% of the projects met with success in dealing with non-public schools. The new lines of communication provided a closer liaison than had previously existed.

c. In about 6% of the programs, lack of adequate records from the non-public schools was a problem. Conflicts in scheduling non-public school students were also identified as a problem area.

d. Recommended by LEA's that the number of non-public children participating be established on a percentage basis.

e. See Table on next page.

10. SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

(a-b) See attached materials

c. See Table of Test Results

Part I 9e Non-Public School Participation

Number of non-public school children who participated in this project by type of arrangement.

Abbreviations:

DUR	during regular school day
BF	before regular school day
AFT	after regular school day
WKE	weekend
SS	summer session

LOCATION	SEA CODE	DUR	BF	AFT	WKE	SS	TOTAL
On Public School Grounds only	03001	423		1037	570	5658	7688
On Non-Public School Grounds only	03002	1979		535		104	2618
On both Public and Non-Public School Grounds	03003	3			5		8
On other than Public or Non-Public School Grounds	03004	2144		2		62	2208
Totals	03999	4549		1574	575	5824	12,522

PART I 10c

For each Standardized Test or other measurement device used in the Project enter the information in the table below.

TYPE	SEA CODE	NAME OF TEST	FORM	SKILL	BEHAVIOR	PRE	POST	DATE TEST GIVEN	LEVEL: P, K 1-3, 4-6, 7-9, 10-12		NUMBER OF STUDENTS	RAW SCORE MEAN	Percentile Distribution by Number of Students			
									Code	Grade			1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-99%
ACHIEVEMENT	010001	Iowa Test of Basic Skills						April 1966								
	010001	Vocabulary	1	X		X			3	3	104	11	35	56	12	1
		Reading	1	X		X			3	3	104	20	46	35	22	1
		Arith. Conc.	1	X		X			3	3	104	11	35	56	12	1
		Vocabulary	2	X		X			4	4	103	16	52	38	12	1
		Reading	2	X		X			4	4	103	27	48	43	9	3
		Arith. Conc.	2	X		X			4	4	102	17	30	49	22	1
		Vocabulary	4	X		X		March 1966	4	5	85	14	52	27	6	0
		Reading	4	X		X			4	5	84	27	48	33	3	0
		Arith. Conc.	4	X		X			4	5	82	15	48	18	15	1
		Vocabulary	3	X		X			4	6	26	15	16	7	2	1
		Reading	3	X		X			4	6	24	23	16	6	2	0
		Arith. Conc.	3	X		X			4	6	26	16	14	8	4	0

PART I 10c (Cont.)

TYPE	SEA CODE	NAME OF TEST	FORM	SKILL	BEHAVIOR	PRE	POST	DATE TEST GIVEN	LEVEL: P, 1-3, 4-6, 7-9, 10-12		NUMBER OF STUDENTS	RAW SCORE MEAN	Percentile Distribution by Number of Students			
									Code	Grade			1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-99%
ACHIEVEMENT	010011	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills						Aug. 1966								
	010011	Vocabulary	a	X			X		3	3	138	13	42	63	24	9
		Reading	a	X			X		3	3	137	20	62	47	22	6
		Arith. Conc.	a	X			X		3	3	137	15	53	35	40	9
		Vocabulary	a	X			X		4	4	112	18	44	50	15	3
		Reading	a	X			X		4	4	108	26	54	37	15	2
		Arith. Conc.	a	X			X		4	4	113	18	30	52	27	4
		Vocabulary	a	X			X		4	5	92	18	35	46	7	4
		Reading	a	X			X		4	5	91	29	43	40	7	1
		Arith. Conc.	a	X			X		4	5	94	19	41	28	20	5
		Vocabulary	a	X			X		4	6	31	17	14	14	2	1
		Reading	a	X			X		4	6	33	25	18	10	5	0
		Arith. Conc.	a	X			X		4	6	31	18	15	10	4	2
		a - alternate form														

PART I 10c (Cont.)

TYPE	SEA CODE	NAME OF TEST	FORM	SKILL	BEHAVIOR	PRE	POST	DATE TEST GIVEN	LEVEL: P, K 1-3, 4-6 7-9, 10-12		NUMBER OF STUDENTS	RAW SCORE MEAN	Percentile Distribution by Number of Students 1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-99%
ACHIEVEMENT	010001	Metropolitan						Aug. 1966	Code	Grade						
		Achievement Test														
		Primary I														
		Word Knowledge	a	X			X		3	1	140	23	66	30	17	27
		Word Discrim.	a	X			X		3	1	140	22	58	39	28	15
		Reading	a	X			X		3	1	137	18	60	46	20	11
		Arithmetic	a	X			X		3	1	135	49	31	39	40	25
		Metropolitan														
		Achievement Test														
		Primary II														
		Word Knowledge	a	X			X		3	2	116	17	35	28	32	18
		Word Discrim.	a	X			X		3	2	115	22	35	28	32	20
		Reading	a	X			X		3	2	113	22	50	38	15	10
		Arithmetic	a	X			X		3	2	115	57	23	20	27	45

a - alternate form

PART I 10c (Cont.)

TYPE	SEA CODE	NAME OF TEST	FORM	SKILL	BEHAVIOR	PRE	POST	DATE TEST GIVEN	LEVEL: P, K 1-3, 4-6, 7-9, 10-12		NUMBER OF STUDENTS	RAW SCORE MEAN	Percentile Distribution by Number of Students 1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-99%
ACHIEVEMENT	010011	Metropolitan Achievement Test Primary I						May 1966	Code	Grade						
		Word Knowledge	A	X		X			3	1	121	15	77	24	12	8
		Word Discrim.	A	X		X			3	1	121	16	71	27	17	6
		Reading	A	X		X			3	1	118	15	60	39	10	9
		Arithmetic	A	X		X			3	1	121	42	57	27	25	12
		Metropolitan Achievement Test Primary II														
		Word Knowledge	A	X		X			3	2	99	15	50	27	13	9
		Word Discrim.	A	X		X			3	2	99	23	36	24	25	14
		Reading	A	X		X			3	2	96	21	42	36	14	4
		Arithmetic	A	X		X			3	2	99	56	32	15	19	33

PART I 10c

TYPE	FORM	SKILL	BEHAVIOR	PRE	POST	DATE TEST GIVEN	LEVEL	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	RAW SCORE MEAN	Percentile Distribution by No. of Students 1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-99%
Intelligence Peabody Picture Vocabulary	A&B	X		X		3/21/66-4/11/66	P	164	IQ Mean 57.72	119	19	17	9
Intelligence Harris Goodenough	Man	X		X		3/17/66-3/19/66	P	169	SS Mean 83.60	111	37	9	12
Intelligence Harris Goodenough	Woman	X		X		3/17/66-3/19/66	P	169	SS Mean 83.75	116	24	13	16
Harris Goodenough	Self	X		X		3/17/66-3/19/66	P	142	SS Mean 81.65	122	26	6	15
Harris Goodenough	Man	X		X	X	6/13/66-6/20/66	P	142	SS Mean 88.10	82	32	20	8
Harris Goodenough	Woman	X			X	6/13/66-6/20/66	P	142	SS Mean 83.25	102	17	12	11
Harris Goodenough	Self	X			X	6/13/66-6/20/66	P	142	SS Mean 83.45	102	24	8	8
Rating Scales Vineland Social Maturity Scales			X	X		3/21/66-4/1/66	P	170	Social Quotient 83.60	No Percentiles Given			
Vineland Social Maturity Scales			X		X	6/13/66-6/20/66	P	166	Social Quotient 94.68	No Percentiles Given			
Other Illinois Test of Psycho-linguistic Abilities	Auditory-Vocal Assn.	X			X	4/24/66-6/20/66	P	106	SS Mean 54.2	No Percentiles Given			
Illinois Test of Psycho-linguistic Abilities	Vocal Encoding	X			X	4/25/66-6/20/66	P	98	SS Mean 63.20	No Percentiles Given			

PART I 10c

TABLES OF OBJECTIVE MEASUREMENT

TEST NAME	FORM	PRE-TEST	POST TEST	DATE	NO. OF STUDENTS	GRADE	RAW SCORE MEAN	PERCENTILE DISTRIBUTION 1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-99%
ARITHMETIC											
Stanford Achievement, Advanced Arithmetic Computation	W	X		7/66	57	7-9	14	29	24	3	1
Stanford Achievement, Advanced Arithmetic Computation	X		X	8/66	54	7-9	18	22	22	9	1
Lankton First Year Algebra	E	X		6/66	34	9-12	15	13	10	9	2
Lankton First Year Algebra	F		X	8/66	34	9-12	19	9	15	8	2
California Achievement, Arithmetic	W	X		4/66	33	4-6	64	2	9	6	12
California Achievement, Arithmetic	Y		X	6/66	29	4-6	69	0	6	8	15
Stanford Achievement, Arithmetic	W	X		9/65	1469	5	3.7				
Stanford Achievement, Arithmetic	X		X	4/66	1432	5	4.9				
READINESS											
Metropolitan Readiness	A	X		6/66	354	K	38.98	142	174	38	0
Metropolitan Readiness	B		X	8/66	354	K	49.45	96	215	40	3
Metropolitan Readiness	R	X		7/66	208	K	51.6	29	93	84	5
Metropolitan Readiness	S		X	8/66	205	K	65	6	60	123	16

PART I 10c (cont.)

TEST NAME	FORM	PRE-TEST	POST TEST	DATE	NO. OF STUDENTS	GRADE	RAW SCORE MEAN	PERCENTILE DISTRIBUTION 1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-99%
READING											
Stanford Achievement, Reading	W	X		9/65	1797	4	2.9				
Stanford Achievement, Reading	X		X	4/66	1730	4	3.7				
Stanford Achievement, Reading	W	X		9/65	1382	6	4.3				
Stanford Achievement, Reading	X		X	4/66	1350	6	5.2				
Gates Reading Test Comprehension	M 1	X		7/66	40	7-9	24.2	17	18	2	3
Gates Reading Test Comprehension	M 2		X	9/66	26	7-9	24.5	10	14	0	2
California Reading Achievement Vocabulary	A	X		6/66	477	1-6	50.59	59	310	108	0
California Reading Achievement Vocabulary	B		X	8/66	477	1-6	54.25	57	313	99	11
California Reading Achievement Comprehension	A	X		6/66	477	1-6	51.41	44	260	173	0
California Reading Achievement Comprehension	B		X	8/66	477	1-6	54.54	41	262	161	13

PART II COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS

1. STATISTICAL INFORMATION

See attached tables.

2. ESTABLISHING PROJECT AREAS

The rank order was similar for all SMSA's:

a. AFDC payments
b. School surveys
c. Census data
d. Housing statistics

3. NEEDS

The following rank order of needs prevailed for all SMSA's:

a. Reading skills
b. Language arts
c. More favorable attitude toward school and education
d. Cultural enrichment
e. Arithmetic skills

4. LEA PROBLEMS

The following problem areas were common to all SMSA's:

a. Lack of trained personnel; reading specialists, speech therapists, counsellors.
b. Delay in delivery of equipment and materials.
c. Lack of adequate space to house activities.

5. PREVALENT ACTIVITIES

The following activities were common to all SMSA's:

a. Special grouping for instruction; including tutorial concept.
b. Counselling services for children and parents.
c. Introduction of new equipment
d. Field trips
e. Health Services; including medical, speech therapy and psychological services.

PART II COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS

1. Statistical Information

UNDUPLICATED COUNT OF PARTICIPANTS (Combine all Title I Projects in the Community for this Table)

Enter in this table individual children who participated in all Title I Projects in the community, children who participated in more than one project should be counted only once. Under Funds Expended, if participation is at more than one level show an estimated proportionate share of funds for that number of children at the particular level.

SMSA Classification A

SEA CODE	GRADE LEVEL	PUBLIC SCHOOL	PRIVATE SCHOOL	NOT ENROLLED	TOTAL	FUNDS EXPENDED	AVG. COST* PER PUPIL
06001	Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten	1,157	120	900	2,177	$ 394,357	$181
06002	1-3	8,741	1,098		9,839	1,667,370	169
06003	4-6	9,721	1,837		11,558	1,711,754	148
06004	7-9	2,983	1,271		4,254	514,885	121
06005	10-12	407	121		528	64,419	122
06999	TOTALS	23,009	4,447	900	28,356	4,352,785	$153

* Average cost determined by dividing Funds Expended by total number of children. Round to nearest dollar.

SMSA Classification B

SEA CODE	GRADE LEVEL	PUBLIC SCHOOL	PRIVATE SCHOOL	NOT ENROLLED	TOTAL	FUNDS EXPENDED	AVG.COST* PER PUPIL
06001	Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten	922	269	534	1,725	$ 246,325	$142
06002	1-3	3,194	1,544	1	4,739	734,647	155
06003	4-6	3,196	1,411		4,607	739,802	161
06004	7-9	794	750		1,544	241,280	156
06005	10-12	16	5	1	22	4,294	195
06999	TOTALS	8,122	3,979	536	12,637	$1,966,348	$155

*Average cost determined by dividing Funds Expended by total number of children. Round to nearest dollar.

SMSA Classification C

SEA CODE	GRADE LEVEL	PUBLIC SCHOOL	PRIVATE SCHOOL	NOT ENROLLED	TOTAL	FUNDS EXPENDED	AVG.COST* PER PUPIL
06001	Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten	377	114	233	724	$ 151,396	$209
06002	1-3	1,394	258		1,652	235,356	142
06003	4-6	1,223	263		1,486	264,310	177
06004	7-9	547	86		633	82,732	130
06005	10-12	461	88	4	553	62,648	113
06999	TOTAL	4,002	809	237	5,048	$ 896,442	$177

*Average cost determined by dividing Funds Expended by total number of children. Round to nearest dollar.

SMSA Classification D

SEA CODE	GRADE LEVEL	PUBLIC SCHOOL	PRIVATE SCHOOL	NOT ENROLLED	TOTAL	FUNDS EXPENDED	AVG. COST* PER PUPIL
06001	Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten	474	45	300	819	$ 128,166.	$156
06002	1-3	2,571	327	3	3151	477,953.	151
06003	4-6	2,759	307	16	3082	446,511.	145
06004	7-9	937	106	15	1058	110,996.	104
06005	10-12	206	17		223	24,976.	112
06999	TOTAL	7,197	802	334	8333	$1,188,602.	$142

* Average cost determined by dividing Funds Expended by total number of children. Round to nearest dollar.

SMSA Classification E

SEA CODE	GRADE LEVEL	PUBLIC SCHOOL	PRIVATE SCHOOL	NOT ENROLLED	TOTAL	FUNDS EXPENDED	AVG.COST* PER PUPIL
06001	Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten	67		13	80	$ 2,467.	$ 31
06002		207	8		215	16,204.	75
06003		185			185	19,910.	108
06004		18			18	1,169.	65
06005							
06999		477	8	13	498	$39,750.	$ 79

*Average cost determined by dividing Funds Expended by total number of children. Round to nearest dollar.

6. INNOVATIVE PROJECTS

a. The small town of Becket with a maximum basic grant of $512.00 and, because of geographical and political factors, was unable to participate in a cooperative project with other communities, constructed project "A-V-I" (Audio-Visual Improvement) Project No. 6-022-128. The project provided for the purchase of several peices of audio-visual equipment and for the services of a person from a local university to instruct the teachers in proper use of a projector, selection of films and teaching aides, etc. Here seems to be an efficient and somewhat imaginative use of a small amount of money in the educational interest of a number of children in a rural Massachusetts town.

In the city of Lynn, a team of educational specialists headed by Dr. Marion Morse, Coordinator of Reading, and Dr. George Laubner, Supervisor of Elementary Education, applied federal funds under Title I totaling $324,000 to pre-school training and reading programs. (Project Nos. 6-163-200 and 6-163-117) Eleven hundred young people in the Lynn public and non-public schools benefited from the two projects that employed more than 200 professional persons essentially in the areas of reading, guidance, speech therapy, cultural enrichment (Field trips), health, physical education, and food services. The pre-school summer program in Lynn provided an instructional staff of 42 primary-trained teachers and a "student body" of 416 youngsters.

New Bedford was another community that made prompt and proper use of Title I money. (Project Nos. 6-201-035, 045, 049, 121, 240, 284, 285, 286, 287, 292, 296 and 297) The local press captured the enthusiasm apparent with school personnel, and one newspaper was prompted to report as follows:

> "Those who participated in the various (Title I) programs were themselves many and varied. About 350 of New Bedford's very young citizens attended daily sessions at local schools in the pre-school program. Physical fitness programs drew 166 boys recommended by health authorities. Workshops in instrumental and vocal music attracted a total of 138 interested youngsters who worked closely with their instructors for a greater appreciation of music and greater proficiency in making it. Two hundred elementary school children with emotional and health problems, learning difficulties, and culturally deprived backgrounds attended two sessions at the school department--operated Camp Echo.

> "High school students -- 98 of them -- whose regular class schedules included no shopwork, flocked to daily classes in industrial arts and home economics held at the junior high schools. Forty one young people attended classes and field trips in a science enrichment course at Roosevelt Junior High School." 1/

The reading group included both youngsters having reading difficulty in school and foreign-born boys and girls who are trying to get a working knowledge of the English language.

The basic remedial program, in reading, language arts, and mathematics was aimed at two trouble spots. One is a group of youngsters just entering 7th grade who have somehow missed out on some of the basic skills needed at the junior high school level. Had these shortcomings not been remedied, these children would almost certainly have had to repeat the grade. The other group was composed of dropouts. Their basic remedial program is designed to give them some practical skills and some confidence. The program is working so well that several have decided to return to school this fall.

The basic plan behind these projects was simple. Many of the individuals in the community -- most of them children -- are having trouble. They are in poor health. They are emotionally maladjusted. They are having difficulty learning. By placing these youngsters -- including many from local parochial schools -- in less formal learning situation, with more individual attention than the average classroom teacher has time to give to any one student, miracles are being accomplished. And the changes, very simply, are brought about because the community and its schools really care.

A Title I project approved and funded for the town of Wellesley in the current year (fiscal 1967) of operation is one entitled, "An Enviornment for Learning." This project employs the services of a special teacher called a Curriculum Materials Resource Teacher who, with classroom teachers and pupils, will develop activities and materials adjusted to learning levels and learning rates and which are self-directing and self-evaluating. Major emphasis will be with three-dimensional non-verbal materials, flim loops, audio tapes, and specialized verbal materials that relate. The project intends to work cooperatively with Wellesley's Title III project, "A Center for Collaborative Learning Media Packages." A special printing press will assist in the multi-sensory approach to learning. The project plans to serve 72 public and non-public school children at the grades 1-6 level. It is a new and exciting approach to the process of educating the disadvantaged.

1/ New Bedford Standard-Times, August 21, 1966

7. METHODS OF INCREASING STAFF

The methods reported by LEA's were common to all SMSA's as below:

a. 60% reported extended use of regular staff
b. 30% reported recruitment as the method used
c. In-service training programs, both of a formal nature and informal orientation meetings, were the most commonly reported method of staff development.

8. MEASURING INSTRUMENTS (Most commonly used tests)

A

LEVEL	INSTRUMENT
Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten	Metropolitan Readiness Tests (R) Detroit Word Recognition (D)
Grades 1-3	California Achievement Tests, 1957, Form W Stanford Achievement Test, W Metropolitan Achievement (B) Gates Primary Reading (3) Stanford Achievement, Primary Battery (J) Otis Quick Scoring, EM
Grades 4-6	SRA Achievement Tests, C, D Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, Elem. D, Adv. D. Stanford Achievement Test (W) Metropolitan Achievement, Intermediate Level AM (1) WISC
Grades 7-9	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, 1 Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, 1, 2, 3, 4 SRA Achievement Tests Stanford Achievement Test Stanford-Binet, LM
Grades 10-12	SRA Achievement Tests Stanford-Binet, LM

B

LEVEL	INSTRUMENT
Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten	Stanford Achievement Tests I (X) Metropolitan Readiness Test (R) Lorge-Thorndike A
Grades 1-3	Stroud-Hieronymous Reading Test Level II Botel Reading Inventories (A) California Achievement Test (W) California Short Form Test of Mental Maturity
Grades 4-6	Stanford Achievement Test (W) California Achievement Tests (W) Wide Range Achievement Test, 1947 Gates Basic Reading Stanford-Binet, LM
Grades 7-9	Gates Reading Test M_1, M_2 Stanford Achievement Test, Adv. (W, X)
Grades 10-12	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (1,2) Otis Quick Scoring Test, EM

C

Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten	Gates McGuite Reading Tests, Primary (2) Metropolitan Achievement Test, Primary (A) Metropolitan Readiness Test A
Grades 1-3	Metropolitan Achievement Test Primary (A) Elem (B) Dolch Basic Sight Word Test (I, II) Iowa Test of Basic Skills, I SRA Achievement Tests C, D California Achievement Test A, B WISC
Grades 4-6	SRA Achievement Tests A, B Iowa Test of Basic Skills, 3 Stanford Achievement Tests, W Metropolitan Achievement Tests, B Bolet Reading Inventory Peabody Picture Vocabulary, A

LEVEL	INSTRUMENT
Grades 7-9	Gates McGuite Reading Test, E WISC Metropolitan Achievement Test Stanford Achievement Test Oits Quick Scoring
Grades 10-12	Iowa Silent Reading Tests, CM Purdue High School English Test
	D
Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten	Metropolitan Readiness Tests, A Lee-Clark Readiness Test
Grades 1-3	Gates Primary Readiness, 1 Metropolitan Achievement Test, A 1 Stanford Achievement Tests Primary I WX - Elem. I, WX Iowa Test of Basic Skills Durrell-Sullivan Reading Capacity and Achievement Test, Primary, A
Grades 4-6	Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability Metropolitan Achievement Test Morrison McCall Spelling Test (1, 3) Durrell-Sullivan Reading Achievement (A, B)
Grades 7-9	Iowa Silent Reading - Advanced Elem. B_{m1} A_{m1} Gates Reading Survey Iowa Test of Basic Skills 1, 2 Stanford-Binet, 4 - 7
Grades 10-12	Cooperative English 2A, 2B Iowa Silent Reading, DM SRA Achievement Test
	E
Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten	Metropolitan Readiness Test
Grades 1-3	Durrell-Sullivan Reading Achievement Metropolitan Achievement, A Stanford-Binet, LM

LEVEL	INSTRUMENT
Grades 4-6	Metropolitan Achievement Gates Basic Reading Test
Grades 7-9	Metropolitan Achievement, A Stanford Achievement WISC
Grades 10-12	SRA Achievement Test

9. ANALYSIS OF EFFECTIVE ACTIVITIES AND METHODS

a. The following distribution of activities is appropriate for each of the SMSA's:

Early Years - Small group instruction
Individual instruction
Counselling
Health services
Testing program

Middle Years- Small group instruction
Individual instruction
Counselling
Field trips
Health services

Teen Years - Small group instruction
Counselling
Individual instruction
Field trips
Home-school coordination

b. In small group and individual instruction as well as counselling, testing and health services, the greatest weakness was common to all -- lack of qualified personnel, delay in receiving equipment, and to a lesser degree -- lack of facilities in which to conduct the program.

The strength of all these activities was increased time for the individual. Each component of the program offered to the child an individual identity -- the chance for success and a clearer interpretation of his role as a student. The teachers were better able to understand the children and hence, conduct an intensive effort in the area of greatest need.

10. GENERAL ANALYSIS OF TITLE I

There can be little question that Title I (ESEA) project activities in Massachusetts enhanced to an appreciable and measurable extent the educational opportunities, experiences, and achievements with a significant number of children during the Fiscal Year 1966 in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

General and specific attitudes with both children and instructional staff were subject to change.

Both in-school year and summer programs, operating essentially on a much smaller pupil-teacher ratio than normally, were able to reach young people in terms of academic and personality problems. Summer programs were particularly effective in this respect.

Insofar as it can be determined at this time, there is a very real "carry over" of project benefits, both academically and attitudinally, from the period of project operation through present time. This is, to us, one of the marked accomplishments of the program.

Both the quality and quantity of total achievement with 1966 Title I projects are gratifying and will justify the many efforts of many people in serving disadvantaged youth.

The following statements have been extracted from various Title I (1966) projects and illustrate the impact of ESEA upon a great number and variety of young people and those adults who worked closely with them:

"--created enthusiasm for learning...willingness and eagerness"
"--attitudes about education has been positive"
"--increases the school ability to hold students in school"
"--guiding and helping the problem child"
"--less defensive attitude which seems accompanied by more spontaniety and openess"
"--students have better understanding of self"
"--confidence and self-acceptance"
"--ability to become independent"
"--lack of pressure-wide range of activities"
"--apathy and frustration replaced by happiness, achievement and fulfillment"
"--Although we had very high hopes regarding the results... they were far beyond our expectations."
"--the program was enthusiastically received by the pupils and the parents"
"--the students sincerely felt the sense of being cared about in school"

"--Many parents reported discernible changes in behavior and attitudes--more interested in life--a new spirit and pride in self"
"--a major breakthrough in communications between children and their parents"
"--The program showed these boys and girls that someone cares"
"--generated great enthusiasm from all involved in the program in regard to reading"
"--learning to read can be fun and very worthwhile"
"--The program was the 'spark' needed to light the education candle for these children"
"--a new atmosphere of respect for the schools"
"--There have been significant, important improvements in reading, speaking and writing skills"
"--Elementary counselors did much to bring a mutuality of understanding and an increase respect in the home-school relationship."
"--provide a motivational atmosphere for underachieving students and possible dropouts"
"--relieved of the pressure to 'keep up' with the group"
"--Behavior problems disappeared and real study skills and habits began to take rout."
"--There has been a direct carry-over from the project to the school program."
"--The emotionally disturbed had sufficient professional services that before the program has been unavailable."
"--Title I has shown what can be done for the educationally deprived when the time and funds are available."
"--A great benefit to the culturally deprived who were handicapped in competition with the average child."
"--Nutritional, medical and dental need in many cases were being met for the first time."
"--The school could assure to each child that, in spite of the handicapps, either physical, mental, or environmental, the child may yet develop sufficient skills to live a life that will be meaningful to him and to society."

PART III TABULAR DATA

TABLE I

Number of Projects Using Specified Types of Tests

	SKILL DEVELOPMENT SUBJECTS (Based on Sample of 150 Projects)	BEHAVIORAL DEVELOPMENT (Based on Sample of 25 Projects)
ACHIEVEMENT	124	2
INTELLIGENCE	31	9
APTITUDE	10	2
LOCALLY MADE TESTS	15	4
RATING SCALES	12	5
ANECDOTAL	12	16
OTHER *	9	6

* Rorschach, Thematic Apperception Test, Goodenough-Harris Drawing Test, Vineland Social Maturity Scale

PART III TABLE II

Reading

Primary Objective: Improve Performance as measured by standard tests

	Excellent Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress
Pre-K & K			
1-3	15	30	1
4-6	26	53	5
7-9	5	10	2
10-12	1	1	
TOTAL	47	94	8

Objective #2: To improve classroom performance to reading beyond usual expectation

	Excellent Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress
Pre-K & K			
1-3	15	33	1
4-6	19	31	8
7-9	5	8	2
10-12		5	2
TOTAL	39	77	13

Objective #3: To improve children's verbal functioning

	Excellent Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress
Pre-K & K	2	2	
1-3	10	24	2
4-6	12	26	2
7-9	2	11	
10-12	1	7	
TOTAL	27	70	4

Objective #4: To change (positively) their attitudes toward school and education

	Excellent Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress
Pre-K & K		3	
1-3	25	9	
4-6	20	14	5
7-9	7	5	2
10-12	2	2	1
TOTAL	54	43	8

Arithmetic

Primary Objective: To improve performance measured by standard achievement

	Excellent Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress
Pre-K & K			
1-3	6	17	
4-6	12	21	1
7-9	5	6	1
10-12		2	
TOTAL	23	46	2

Objective #2: To improve performance in skill area beyond usual expectation

	Excellent Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress
Pre-K & K			
1-3	7	9	1
4-6	3	12	3
7-9	1	2	1
10-12			1
TOTAL	11	23	6
			6

Cultural Enrichment

Primary Objective: To improve the Children's self-image

	Excellent Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress
Pre-K & K		6	
1-3	15	8	
4-6	17	7	
7-9	4	1	
10-12		1	
TOTAL	36	23	0

Objective #2: To change (positively) their attitudes toward school and education

	Excellent Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress
Pre-K & K			
1-3	7	9	1
4-6	10	11	1
7-9	4	2	
10-12	1		
TOTAL	22	22	2

HEALTH SERVICES

Primary Objective: To improve the physical health of the children

	Excellent Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress
Pre-K & K	6		
1-3	3	9	
4-6	3	10	1
7-9	2	1	
10-12			
TOTAL	14	20	1

Objective #2: To improve the nutritional health of the children

	Excellent Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress
Pre-K & K	8		
1-3	6	7	
4-6	5	10	
7-9	2	3	
10-12			
TOTAL	21	20	0

PRE-SCHOOL

Primary Objective: To improve children's verbal functioning

	Excellent Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress
Pre-K & K	14	8	0

Objective #2: To improve children's emotional and social stability

	Excellent Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress
Pre-K & K	6	9	0

Objective #3: To change (positively) their attitudes toward school and education

	Excellent Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress
Pre-K & K	6	4	1

Counselling

Primary Objective: To improve the children's self-image

	Excellent Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress
Pre-K & K			
1-3	5	17	
4-6	9	14	
7-9	4	7	1
10-12		2	
TOTAL	18	40	1

Objective #2: To change (positively) attitudes toward school and education

	Excellent Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress
Pre-K & K			
1-3	4	10	1
4-6	7	13	1
7-9	2	6	
10-12	1	2	
TOTAL	14	31	2

Objective #3: To improve the children's emotional and social stability

	Excellent Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress
Pre-K & K			
1-3	2	12	
4-6	4	15	1
7-9		3	
10-12		1	
TOTAL	6	31	1

AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP (ADM) [1] AND AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE (ADA) [2] FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED TO SCHOOLS NOT HAVING TITLE I PROJECTS

To be completed only for public school enrollees in projects that operated during the school day in the regular school year.
Enter data for each grade level in the school.
Summarize for all Projects in the Community.

PAPT III TABLE III

		IF POSSIBLE 1963 - 1964				IF POSSIBLE 1964 - 1965				1965 - 1966			
		TITLE I SCHOOLS		NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS		TITLE I SCHOOLS		NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS		TITLE I SCHOOLS		NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS	
SEA CODE	GRADE	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA
090001	1					365	336	792	648	294	285	512	478
090002	2					356	329	801	756	273	254	459	462
090003	3					359	332	798	740	254	247	486	461
090004	4					351	328	770	729	263	241	438	409
090005	5					353	328	777	735	272	261	543	507
090006	6					419	385	886	833	276	266	682	579
090007	7					163	154	399	378	274	254	433	409
090008	8					184	173	388	363	388	346	623	589
090009	9					199	178	415	395	389	360	686	650
090010	10					233	221	503	466	348	327	240	227
090011	11					242	225	499	470	352	318	436	412
090012	12					248	235	538	502	330	307	207	194

1/ Formula for determining ADM: The aggregate days membership of the school year or a given reporting period divided by the number of days school is in session during the period. Round to nearest whole number.

2/ Formula for determining ADA: The aggregate days attendance of a given school during a given reporting period divided by the number of days school is in session during this period. Round to nearest whole number.

DROPOUT RATES (HOLDING POWER) FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED * WITH NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

Summarize for all Projects in the Community which operated during the regular school year. Do not include summer, Saturday or after-school projects.
Enter data for each grade level in the school.
See next two pages for worksheet and definitions.

PART III TABLE V

SEA CODE	GRADE	If Possible 1964-1965		1965 - 1966	
		TITLE I SCHOOLS	NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS	TITLE I SCHOOLS	NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS
07001	12	2.0		2.5	
07002	11	5.1		4.3	
07003	10	5.4		5.2	
07004	9	4.1		3.8	
07005	8				
07006	7				
07007	(Lower grade levels, if appropriate)				
07008	Number of Schools	9		9	
07009	Total Number of Students	8764		8749	
07010	Number of Dropouts	310		240	

*The State norm for 1964-65 in grades 9-12 was 3.54%

PART III TABLE VI

STUDENTS IN TITLE I PROJECT HIGH SCHOOLS (GRADES 9-12) * CONTINUING EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL

Summarize for all high school projects in the community.
To be completed only for public school enrollees.

SEA CODE		IF POSSIBLE 1963 - 1964	IF POSSIBLE 1964 - 1965	1965 - 1966
		TITLE I SCHOOLS	TITLE I SCHOOLS	TITLE I SCHOOLS
08001	Total Number of Graduates	1840	2012	2363
08002	Mean Size of Graduating Class	230	251	263
08003	Number of Graduates Continuing Education	1901	1240	1226
08004	Number of Schools Having 0-10% Continuing Graduates			
08005	11-20%			
08006	21-30%			
08007	31-40%			
08008	41-50%			1
08009	51-60%	3	2	2
08010	61-99%	5	6	6
08011	Number of Schools	8	8	9

A student is considered to continue his education if he enters one of the following, on either a full or part-time basis: Post Graduate High School Course, Junior College, College or University, a Vocational or Technical Institute, or a Nursing School.

*State norm for 1962 is 52.5% of high school graduates involved in continuing education.

PART III TABLE VIII

A. The Five Most Commonly Funded Projects by Project Objectives

1. To improve performance as measured by standardized achievement tests.
2. To improve classroom performance in reading beyond usual expectations.
3. To improve children's verbal functioning.
4. To change (in a positive way) their attitudes toward school and education.
5. To improve the children's self-image.

B. Approaches Used for the Five Most Commonly Funded Projects

1. Increased teacher time, teacher aides, audio-visual equipment, programmed reading, special personnel
2. Small group instruction, aides, individual reading programs including diagnostic profile
3. Enrichment through cultural visits, speech therapy programs, increased teacher time
4. Small group instruction, informal atmosphere in groups, field trips, providing opportunity for success, contact with family
5. Social services program, increased counselling staff

Supplementary Table based on a Sample of 200 Projects

For each Instructional and Service Area in your Project, complete the data specified in the table.

ACTIVITY	Number of Children Participating												Estimated Cost of Activity
	Pre		K - 3		4 - 6		7 - 9		10-12		Not Enrolled	Total	
	Pu	Pr	Pu	Pr	Pu	Pr	Pu	Pr	Pu	Pr			
Instructional Area													
Art	57	—	8,544	754	7,732	1,568	612	276	46	26	10	19,625	$ 130,894.
Business Education							33	3	80	29		145	5,104.
Cultural Enrichment	379	50	3,545	656	3,213	758	748	318			5	9,672	161,936.
Language Arts			8,631	534	7,734	793	635	291	125	4	9	18,756	213,885.
English, Second Lang.			15	—	9	6	3	—				33	3,577.
Reading	92	—	12,378	1,717	13,940	2,568	2,744	886	369	50	41	34,785	1,211,602.
Foreign Language	97	28					109	14	20	—		268	14,997.
Home Economics							17	35				52	15,000.
Industrial Arts			31	10	36	68	56	73				274	18,947.
Kindergarten			1,018	90								1,108	107,635.
Math	29	—	3,034	798	11,332	908	2,007	523	190	14	4	18,899	281,176.
Music	75	—	8,504	450	7,428	847	573	197			5	18,004	78,544.
Physical Education	372	50	2,430	609	1,409	708	228	193	30	—	12	6,041	88,183.
Pre-Kindergarten	387	61										448	32,946.

Supplementary Table based on a Sample of 200 Projects

ACTIVITY	Number of Children Participating: Pre Pu	Pre Pr.	K - 3 Pu	K - 3 Pr	4 - 6 Pu	4 - 6 Pr	7 - 9 Pu	7 - 9 Pr	10 - 12 Pu	10 - 12 Pr	Not Enrolled	Total	Estimated Cost of Activity
Science	350	—	6,939	70	6,404	412	260	109	32	—		14,576	$123,277.
Social Studies			273	45	6,404	362	173	4	76	4		7,361	50,908.
General Elem/Sec	37	13	7,134	300	5,861	1,015	1,344	341	44	24		16,133	252,106.
Speech Therapy	335	50	1,014	187	630	167	45	38	5	—	5	2,538	64,738.
Special Education											31	31	6,690.
Vocational Education							59	11	13	4		87	18,133.
Work-Study							100	--	13	—		113	2,223.
Reduce Class Size			6,473	27	5,934	31	145	48	39	—		12,737	408,532.
Teacher Aides	487	50	8,101	657	7,294	1,375	217	115				18,326	169,147.
Other	107	—	981	240	936	335	349	131			5	3,133	63,618.
Service Area													
Food (Breakfast)					34	2	50	7			5	98	400.
Food (Lunch)	91	13	1,835	430	1,693	416	403	168	13	7	5	5,074	67,598.
Food (Snack)	132	2	3,675	586	6,908	1,765	449	193			10	13,720	70,497.
Clothing			58	6	38	—						102	135.
Waiver of Fees	29	--	739	67	678	124	283	85				2,005	27,519.
Health	221	15	3,427	530	2,504	555	756	196	352	26	38	8,660	89,058.

Supplementary Table based on a Sample of 200 Projects

ACTIVITY	Number of Children Participating: Pre Pu	Pre Pr	K - 3 Pu	K - 3 Pr	4 - 6 Pu	4 - 6 Pr	7 - 9 Pu	7 - 9 Pr	10-12 Pu	10-12 Pr	Not Enrolled	Total	Estimated Cost of Activity
Psychiatric Service	7	--	103	12	68	14	4	2	37	--	4	251	$ 10,634.
Psychological Service	211	15	1,331	202	1,020	312	345	210	76	12	5	3,739	70,420.
School Social Work	76	--	815	116	668	209	245	93	86	12	55	2,345	35,059.
Attendance Service	27	2	70	15	9	55	99	50			327	327	2,340.
Guidance and Counseling	15	--	1,522	218	1,907	404	1,357	339	520	28	630	6,940	157,474.
Library Services	46	--	1,779	1,044	1,759	970	1,019	868	151	12	56	7,704	54,536.
Curriculum Material Center			158	30	77	19						269	426.
Tutoring/After School					254							254	2,250.
Transportation	243	10	9,596	785	8,345	819	712	266	102	10	29	20,877	170,494.
Related Services - Parents			78	3	280	9	39	4	20	--	52	485	5,666.
In-Service (Personnel)			6,548	35	5,959	72	279	86			46	13,025	151,132.
Pre-Service (Personnel)			139	33	186	102	431	147	37	--	33	1,108	28,528.
Other	112	13	991	386	1,048	369	421	87	13	4	10	3,445	50,196.

Staff Participation Supplementary Information

Enter the number of individuals serving in the project according to category.

SEA CODE	POSITION	NO. IN-SERVICE TRAINING	NO. SALARIED BY TITLE I ONLY	NO. REGULAR STAFF EXTRA HOURS BY TITLE I	NO. UNPAID VOLUNTEERS	NO. UNFILLED POSITIONS
04001	TEACHER - Elementary	1886	2975	1090	46	102
04002	TEACHER - Secondary	283	408	326	12	49
04003	ADMINISTRATOR	141	201	188	33	51
04004	COUNSELOR	47	162	41	4	14
04005	SPEECH THERAPIST	19	71	23	1	9
04006	SOCIAL WORKER	33	57	62	2	4
04007	LIBRARIAN	16	30	17	7	
04008	NURSE	30	92	99	15	3
04009	PHYSICIAN	10	29	45	2	3
04010	DENTIST	6	17	15	2	3
04011	DENTAL HYGIENIST	1	8		4	6
04012	PSYCHIATRIST	6	17	4	3	3
04013	TEACHER AIDE	230	740	166	122	30
04014	CLERICAL	83	193	174	65	40
04015	CUSTODIAN	41	177	120	8	26
04016	COOK	1	34	32	2	14
04017	OTHER	56	191	365	37	44